

REMARKS

Claims 2-16 and 18-19 are pending herein.

I. The allowable subject matter.

Applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for indicating the allowed claims 13-16 and the allowable subject matter in claims 3-12 and 18. Applicants respectfully accept the allowable subject matter as indicated in the following table:

| Amended claim number | Previous claim on which amended claim is based |
|----------------------|--|
| 3 (independent) | 1 + 3 |
| 6 (independent) | 1 + 6 |
| 12 (independent) | 1 + 12 |
| 18 (independent) | 17 + 18 |

Applicants respectfully note that claims 1 and 17 have been cancelled.

II. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Applicants respectfully note that the preamble of claim 19 has been amended to read: "A computer readable medium encoded with a computer program for processing an image to be displayed as a single screen image, performing the steps of." Claim 20 has been cancelled.

Thus, it is respectfully asserted that the § 101 rejection has been overcome.

III. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The USPTO respectfully rejects claims 1, 2, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nagai et al. (US 7,155,037 B2). Claims 1 and 17 have been cancelled.

A. Claim 2.

Claim 2 has been amended to depend from claim 3. As noted above, claim 3 contains allowable subject matter and has been rewritten in independent form. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that dependent claim 2 is also allowable.

B. Claim 19 has been amended to incorporate claim 20, which contains the same allowable subject matter as claim 6.

Claim 19 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 20 and now reads in relevant part:

“wherein, when not in said determining step, said oriented direction of said image is recognized, based on a background-feature quantity obtained by comparing a feature quantity, extracted from an image area included in said image, with another feature quantity, extracted from another image area included in said image.”

It is respectfully noted that these limitations of claim 19 (formerly of claim 20) are the same as the limitations of claim 6. As indicated on pages 5-6 of the Office Action, the prior art does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 6.

Thus, because claim 6 contains allowable subject matter, it is respectfully asserted that claim 19 is also allowable after incorporating the same allowable subject matter quoted above.

IV. Conclusion.

Reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Please contact the undersigned for any reason. Applicants seek to cooperate with the Examiner including via telephone if convenient for the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By 

Daniel P. Lent

Registration No. 44,867

Date: August 30, 2007
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No.: 23413